

Response to Restriction Requirement
U.S. Patent Application S.N. 09/787,614
January 6, 2005

Arguments traversing the election of species requirement

The Examiner's rationale for the election requirement under PCT Rule 13.1 is given in paragraph no. 5 of the Office action. The Examiner states that there is a lack of a "corresponding special technical feature." However, according to PCT Rule 13.2, a "special technical feature" is a technical feature that defines a contribution of the claimed invention over the prior art. The Examiner **has not discussed the prior art** in stating this rationale.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's statement that "each compound of formulae I-1 to I-5 not only has different chemical structure also has different liquid crystal properties" is unclear and **does not appear to represent a proper basis for an election of species requirement**. Moreover, page 17, lines 18-27, of the present specification discusses the chemical relationship between the compounds of general formulas (I-1) to (I-5). The specification also discusses the relevant properties in common among these compounds, including the low lower limit temperature of the liquid crystalline phase.

Withdrawal of the election of species requirement is therefore respectfully requested.

Response to Restriction Requirement
U.S. Patent Application S.N. 09/787,614
January 6, 2005

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

In the event any additional fees are required in connection with this response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Daniel A. Geselowitz, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,573

DAG/plb
Atty. Docket No. **010347**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE